

Amendments to the Drawings:

The drawing sheets attached in connection with the above-identified application containing Figures 1(a), 1(b) and 2-10 are being presented as a new formal drawing sheet or sheets to be substituted for the previously submitted drawing sheet or sheets.

REMARKS

Status of Claims

The Office Action mailed March 29, 2007 has been reviewed and the comments of the Patent and Trademark Office have been considered. Claims 1-16 were pending in the application. Claims 1-3, 5-7, 9, 10 and 13- 16 have been amended. Support for these amendments, for example, can be found on page 19, lines 5-16. A detailed listing of all claims that are, or were, in the application, irrespective of whether the claim(s) remain under examination in the application, are presented, with an appropriate defined status identifier. Therefore, claims 1-16 are pending in the application.

Objection to the Drawings:

The Office Action requires formal drawings. In reply, new drawings in compliance with 37 C.F.R. § 121(d) are submitted herewith.

35 U.S.C. § 112 Rejection

Claims 1-16 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph for being generally narrative and indefinite. The claims have been amended to address this issue. Reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection is respectfully requested. If any issues remain after this amendment, further clarification is respectfully requested.

35 U.S.C. § 101 Rejection

Claim 15 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 101. This claim has been amended to recite a computer-implemented method. Applicant submits that the recited method of claim 15 produces a useful, tangible, and concrete result, and therefore complies with 35 U.S.C. § 101. Reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection is respectfully requested.

Prior Art Rejections

In the Office Action, claim 1 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent Application Publication 2002/0143646 to Boyden (hereinafter “Boyden”). Claims 2-16 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Boyden in view of by U.S. Patent Application Publication 2002/0116305 to Abhyanker (hereinafter “Abhyanker”). Applicants respectfully traverse these rejections for at least the following reasons.

Claim 1 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by Boyden. Claim 1 has been amended to recite an auction system “wherein the amount of the delivery charge borne by the dealer is dependent upon the auction commodity which is to be sold.” Boyden is directed towards an auction system for used cars. Boyden generally teaches determining delivery costs for an auction commodity (a used car) that is sold. However, there is no teaching in Boyden of a determination of how much of the delivery charge is to be borne by the dealer, let alone any teaching of such a determination depending upon the auction commodity that is sold. If this rejection is maintained, the examiner is respectfully requested to point out where these features are disclosed in Boyden.

Claims 2-16 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Boyden in view of Abhyanker. Independent claims 2, 7, 10, 13 and 16 recite a similar limitation as that of claim 1, generally citing an auction system “wherein the amount of the delivery charge borne by the dealer is dependent upon the auction commodity which is to be sold.” The comments pertaining to Boyden above are equally applicable here. Boyden fails to teach or suggest the a relationship between the auction commodity and the amount of delivery charge that is borne by the dealer. That is, there is no teaching or suggestion in Boyden of an auction system “wherein the amount of the delivery charge borne by the dealer is dependent upon the auction commodity which is to be sold”.

Abhyanker fails to make up for the deficiencies of Boyden as shown above. Abhyanker is directed towards facilitating an auction and selecting shipping services through a bidding method. The portal of Abhyanker either selects a bid, or allows the buyer or seller to select a bid. There is no teaching or suggestion in Abhyanker of a determination of how much of the bid (delivery charge) is to be borne by the dealer, let alone any teaching of such a determination depending upon the auction commodity that is sold.

As shown above, Boyden also fails to teach this feature of independent claims 2, 7, 10, 13 and 16. Thus, Abhyanker, either alone or in combination with Boyden, would also fail to teach all of the limitations of the independent claims 2, 7, 10, 13 and 16. If this rejection is maintained, the examiner is respectfully requested to point out where these features are disclosed in either Boyden or Abhyanker.

The dependent claims are also patentable for at least the same reasons as the independent claims on which they ultimately depend. In addition, they recite additional

patentable features when considered as a whole. As mentioned above, Applicant believes that the present application is now in condition for allowance. Favorable reconsideration of the application as amended is respectfully requested.

Conclusion

In view of the foregoing amendments and remarks, Applicant believes that the application is now in condition for allowance. An indication of the same is respectfully requested. If there are any questions regarding the application, the examiner is invited to contact the undersigned attorney at the local telephone number below.

The Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge any additional fees which may be required regarding this application under 37 C.F.R. §§ 1.16-1.17, or credit any overpayment, to Deposit Account No. 19-0741. Should no proper payment be enclosed herewith, as by a check or credit card payment form being in the wrong amount, unsigned, post-dated, otherwise improper or informal or even entirely missing, the Commissioner is authorized to charge the unpaid amount to Deposit Account No. 19-0741. If any extensions of time are needed for timely acceptance of papers submitted herewith, Applicant hereby petitions for such extension under 37 C.F.R. §1.136 and authorizes payment of any such extensions fees to Deposit Account No. 19-0741.

Respectfully submitted,

Date June 29, 2007

By Ramya Ananthanarayanan

FOLEY & LARDNER LLP
Customer Number: 22428
Telephone: (202) 945-6059
Facsimile: (202) 672-5399

George C. Beck
Attorney for Applicant
Registration No. 38,072

Ramya Ananthanarayanan
Attorney for Applicant
Registration No. 59597